

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,454	03/02/2004	Yoshitaka Honda	17506	3468
· 23389 75	590 10/18/2006	EXAMINER		
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA SUITE 300			JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			3768	
			DATE MAIL ED. 10/19/200	۷.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/791,454	HONDA ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jaworski Francis J.	3768
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap		
Period for	or Reply		
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Faild Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	PATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1)[\inf	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 J	ulv 2006.	
		s action is non-final.	
· —	Since this application is in condition for allowa		ters, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under the	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	ion of Claims		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application	1.	
,—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>9-10</u> is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
·	<u> </u>	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
ŕ	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	•
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing	y(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	, p. 10.10, a. 10.0	3 (=) (=) (.)
,	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		•••
	application from the International Burea	<u>*</u>	•
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not	received.
Attachmer	` '	🗂 .	
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		Informal Patent Application
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/791,454

Art Unit: 3768

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9 - 10 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Sakurai et al (US5076276) and any one of Costin

(US5520633) or Sekino et al (US6383183). Sakurai et al is directed to an ultrasound puncture system having handpiece, probe with cover tube, power source 41 and thresholded impedance detection circuit as shown in Fig.2. Although thresholding is set in Sakurai et al as a function of presence of fluid as determining a critical minimal loading state per col. 8 lines 1 – 30, it would have been obvious in view of Costin col. 5 lines 3-48 to regulate both aspiration and applied power as a function of detected impedance whereupon it would have been inherently obvious not to destroy unintended tissue structures not part of the eye being operated on. Additionally a digital embodiment using mapping values is contemplated per col. 9 lines 24 – 64. In the alternative, Sekino et al in col. 9 line 32 – col. 10 line 5 suggests that impedance feedback using graph thresholds may result in interrupted power application with periods of zero power application to avoid heating effects.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 - 8 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicants arguments with respect to claims 9 and 10 are not well taken since both the references represent lavage functions requiring pump circulation and the ultrasound devices having a vibratory tissue disruptive effect are capable of puncturing a biological wall.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/791,454 Page 4

Art Unit: 3768

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj 10-12-2006

Fráncis J. Jaworski Primary Examiner